

Appl. No. 10/645,462
Amdt. dated November 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-38 are presently pending in the application.

In this amendment, Claims 17-22, 25-28, 34 and 35 have been amended.

Claims 1-16, 23, 24, 29-33 and 36-38 remain unchanged.

No claims have been added or canceled.

As set forth below, the amendments to the Claims are believed to place the Claims in condition for allowance. In view of the amendments, as discussed below, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the Application and issuance of a Notice of Allowability are thus respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 1-16, 32-34 and 36-38 have been allowed, and, that in view of the allowance of Claim 1, that the restriction requirement of has been withdrawn. Hence, Applicant understands that all claims are now pending and that no claims stand withdrawn.

Objection To The Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings, stating that cavities of the spindle which receive the planet rollers (as set forth in Claim 23) are not shown in the drawings. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cavities 20 which receive the planet rollers are shown, for example, in Figures 1 and 2 of the application. In Fig. 2, the reference no. 20 appears on the left side of the figure, slightly above the center shaft 4. The lead line from

Page 18 of 21

10 November 2005

N:\Patent\TITIMK Applications\TITIMK 07659\TITIMK 7859C1\TITIMK 7859C1 - Amendment A.doc

Appl. No. 10/645,462
Amdt. dated November 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

the reference number 20 leads to the cavity which receives the planet rollers. The cavities 20 are also shown in FIGS. 5, 6, and 8, but are not numbered or otherwise called out in these figures. In view of the fact that the cavity set forth in Claim 23 is shown in the drawings, a replacement drawing is not being submitted herewith, and Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification, noting that the abstract was longer than 150 words. Additionally, the Examiner requested that the status of the parent application be updated. The specification has been amended, as noted above, to update the status of the parent application, and to shorten the abstract. The abstract as amended is believed to be about 150 words long. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

§112 Rejections

The Examiner objected to Claims 17-31 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112 noted several formalities. As discussed below, the claims (or the subject matter thereof) has been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

In Claim 17, the Examiner asserted that "said planet axles" in line 6 lacked antecedent basis. In view of the amendments to Claim 17, as discussed below, the §112 rejections to Claim 17 are believed to be moot.

Page 19 of 21

10 November 2005

N:\Patent\TDMK Applications\TDMK 07859C1\TDMK 7859C1 - Amendment A.doc

Appl. No. 10/645,462
Amdt. dated November 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

The double inclusion of the first and second planet rollers in Claim 20 has been removed.

Claim 19 has been amended to remove the double inclusion of the "first and second sun rollers".

Claim 35 has been amended to remove the double inclusion of the sun roller recesses.

Lastly, Claim 34 was amended to remove a typographical error.

The claims as now presented are believed to comply with §112. Withdrawal of the §112 rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 1-16, 32-24 and 36-38 have been allowed, and that Claims 20, 28-31 and 35 would be allowable if amended to overcome the §112 rejections thereto. As discussed above, Claims 20, 28-31 and 35 have been amended to overcome the §112 rejections, and hence are believed to be allowable along with Claims 1-16, 32-24 and 36-38.

35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

The Examiner rejected Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Applicant Xiaollan Ai's prior Pat. No. 6095940 (Ai). Further, the Examiner rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Ai in view of

Page 20 of 21

10 November 2005

N:\Patents\TSMK Applications\TSMK 07859\TSMK 7859C1\TSMK 7859C1 - Amendment A.doc

Appl. No. 10/645,462
Amdt. dated November 11, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 16, 2005

Nakamura (JP 6-94092) and Claims 25-26 as being obvious over Ai in view of Myers (US 4330045).

Claim 17, which was filed as an independent claim, has been amended to depend from Claim 20. In amending Claim 17, Applicants are not conceding the Examiner's rejection over original Claim 17, and maintain the right to pursue a continuation application with respect to Claim 17. Claims 18, 19, and 21-27 have also been amended to depend from Claim 20. Inasmuch as Claims 17-19 and 21-27 now all depend from allowable Claim 20, Claims 17-19 and 21-27 are also deemed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-38 are believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowability with respect to these claims is thus respectfully requested.

Dated: 11/11/05

Respectfully Submitted,


Jonathan P. Soifer, Reg. No. 34,932
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200
St. Louis, Missouri 63131
Tel: (314) 238-2400
Fax: (314) 238-2401
e-mail: jsoifer@patpro.com